



May 17, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Wanda Calderon
Government Information Specialist
US EPA Region 2
290 Broadway
New York, New York 10007-1866
calderon.wanda@epa.gov

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information Officer:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552 et seq. and the implementing regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 40 C.F.R. Part 2, I—Yessenia Funes, reporter of Gizmodo Media Group—make the following request for records.

On Sept. 20, Hurricane Maria hit the island of Puerto Rico. EPA Public Affairs Specialist Elizabeth Sundin informed us that the Battery Recycling Superfund site in Arecibo, Puerto Rico, suffered some flooding in the hurricane's wake. In light of this knowledge, the concern residents of Arecibo has voiced to us, and prior incidents related to the Battery Recycling Company's site (before becoming a Superfund) where the EPA knew lead was leaching and failed to act in a timely manner to avoid a health crisis¹, we seek to shed light on the extent of the flooding that occurred after Hurricane Maria, and any contamination that may have resulted from it.

Requested Records

We request that EPA produce the following communications **between it and the Junta de Calidad Ambiental, including but not limited to its governing board members and employees**, within twenty business days and further seek expedited review of this request for the reasons identified below.

1. Communications related to the clean up of the Battery Recycling Superfund site after Hurricanes Irma and Maria that occurred both before or after the hurricane
2. Communications regarding any water, soil, or any other environmental contamination concerns as a result of Hurricanes Irma or Maria.
3. Communications highlighting any concerns officials had about the Battery Recycling Superfund site during this time that does not relate to Hurricanes Irma or Maria

¹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention — <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6147a4.htm>

Please provide all responsive records from September 9, 2017, through the date of the search. The search for responsive records should include all individuals and locations where records are likely to exist.

In addition to the records requested above, we request records describing the processing of this request, including records sufficient to identify search terms used and locations and custodians searched and any tracking sheets used to track the processing of this request. If the EPA uses FOIA questionnaires or certifications completed by individual custodians or components to determine whether they possess responsive materials or to describe how they conducted searches, we also request any such records prepared in connection with the processing of this request.

We seek all responsive records **regardless of format, medium, or physical characteristics**. In conducting your search, please understand the term “communications” in its broadest sense, to include any written, typed, recorded, graphic, printed, or audio material of any kind. We seek records of any kind, including electronic records, audiotapes, videotapes, and photographs, as well as letters, emails, facsimiles, telephone messages, voice mail messages and transcripts, notes, or minutes of any meetings, telephone conversations or discussions. Our request includes any attachments to these records. No category of material should be omitted from search, collection, and production.

You may not exclude searches of files or emails in the personal custody of your officials, **such as personal email accounts**. Records of official business conducted using unofficial systems or stored outside of official files is subject to the Federal Records Act and FOIA.² It is not adequate to rely on policies and procedures that require officials to move such information to official systems within a certain period of time; we have a right to records contained in those files even if material has not yet been moved to official systems or if officials have, through negligence or willfulness, failed to meet their obligations.³ If any potentially responsive records have been destroyed and/or transferred to other agencies or offices, such as the National Archives and Records Agency (NARA), then I request copies of the destruction or transfer slips as well as any other documentation relating to, mentioning or describing said transfer or destruction, to include but not be limited to confirmation that the EPA has no other copies of said records.

In addition, please note that in conducting a “reasonable search” as required by law, you must employ the most up-to-date technologies and tools available, in addition to searches by individual custodians likely to have responsive information. Recent technology may have rendered the EPA’s prior FOIA practices unreasonable. In light of the government-wide requirements to manage information electronically by the end of 2016, it is no longer reasonable to rely exclusively on custodian-driven searches.⁴ Furthermore, agencies that have adopted the NARA Capstone program, or similar policies, now maintain emails in a form that is reasonably likely to be more complete than individual custodians’ files. For example, a custodian may have deleted a responsive email from his or her email program, but the EPA’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone.

² See *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy*, 827 F.3d 145, 149–50 (D.C. Cir. 2016); cf. *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Kerry*, 844 F.3d 952, 955–56 (D.C. Cir. 2016)

³ See *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy*, No. 14-cv-765, slip op. at 8 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2016) (“The Government argues that because the agency had a policy requiring [the official] to forward all of his emails from his [personal] account to his business email, the [personal] account only contains duplicate agency records at best. Therefore, the Government claims that any hypothetical deletion of the [personal account] emails would still leave a copy of those records intact in [the official’s] work email. However, policies are rarely followed to perfection by anyone. At this stage of the case, the Court cannot assume that each and every work-related email in the [personal] account was duplicated in [the official’s] work email account.” (citations omitted))

⁴ Presidential Memorandum—Managing Government Records, 76 Fed. Reg. 75,423 (Nov. 28, 2011), <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/11/28/presidential-memorandum-managing-government-records>; Office of Mgmt. & Budget, Exec. Office of the President, Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments & Independent Agencies, “Managing Government Records Directive,” M-12-18 (Aug. 24, 2012), <https://www.archives.gov/files/records-mgmt/m-12-18.pdf>

Accordingly, we insist that the EPA **use the most up-to-date technologies to search for responsive information** and take steps to ensure that the most complete repositories of information are searched.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies must adopt a presumption of disclosure, withholding information “only if . . . disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption” or “disclosure is prohibited by law.”⁵ If it is your position that any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, we request that you **provide an index of those documents** as required under *Vaughn v. Rosen*, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973), cert. denied, 415 U.S. 977 (1974). As you are aware, a Vaughn index must describe each document claimed as exempt with sufficient specificity “to permit a reasoned judgment as to whether the material is actually exempt under FOIA.”⁶ Moreover, the Vaughn index “must describe *each* document or portion thereof withheld, and for *each* withholding it must discuss the consequences of disclosing the sought-after information.”⁷ Further, “the withholding agency must supply ‘a relatively detailed justification, specifically identifying the reasons why a particular exemption is relevant and correlating those claims with the particular part of a withheld document to which they apply.’”⁸

In the event some portions of the requested records are properly exempt from disclosure, **please disclose any reasonably segregable nonexempt portions of the requested records**. If it is your position that a document contains non-exempt segments, but that those non-exempt segments are so dispersed throughout the document as to make segregation impossible, please state what portion of the document is non-exempt, and how the material is dispersed throughout the document.⁹ Claims of non-segregability must be made with the same degree of detail as required for claims of exemptions in a Vaughn index. If a request is denied in whole, please state specifically that it is not reasonable to segregate portions of the record for release.

You should **institute a preservation hold** on information responsive to this request. We intend to pursue all legal avenues to enforce its right of access under FOIA, including litigation if necessary. Accordingly, the EPA is on notice that **litigation is reasonably foreseeable**.

Fee Waiver

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) and 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(I), we request a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. The subject of this request concerns the operations of the federal government, and the disclosures will likely contribute to a better understanding of relevant government procedures by the general public in a significant way.

Moreover, Gizmodo is an online news organization and therefore we are entitled to a fee waiver on the grounds that disclosure of the information sought is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.

Regardless, we are willing to pay fees for this request up to \$50 without prior approval. If you estimate that the fees will exceed this limit, please notify me first.

⁵ FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 § 2 (Pub. L. No. 114–185)

⁶ *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979)

⁷ *King v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 830 F.2d 210, 223–24 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (emphasis in original)

⁸ *Id.* at 224 (citing *Mead Data Central, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 566 F.2d 242, 251 (D.C. Cir. 1977))

⁹ *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261

Further Correspondence

Where possible, please provide responsive material in electronic format by email (yessenia.funes@gizmodomedia.com) or in PDF or TIF format on a USB drive. Please send any responsive material being sent by mail to: Gizmodo Media Group (% Yessenia Funes), 2 West 17th Street, 2nd Floor, New York, NY 10011.

Finally, **we request rolling production of these records** as they are located and reviewed.

We look forward to working with the EPA on this request. If you do not understand any part of this request, have any questions, or foresee any problems in fully releasing the requested records, please contact Yessenia Funes at yessenia.funes@gizmodomedia.com. Also, if our request for a fee waiver is not granted in full, please contact us immediately upon making such a determination.

Please be aware that under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A), a FOIA request is considered constructively denied after twenty business days and is subject to an appeal on that basis.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Yessenia Funes